

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY****AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached drawing sheet 4 replaces the previously submitted sheet 4, and includes corrections to Figure 4. Figure 4 has been amended to change POWER RAIL 270 to POWER RAIL 240, and REGULATED VOLTAGE 250 to REGULATED VOLTAGE 260, as suggested in the November 17, 2006 Office Action.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 4

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 20 2007

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to an Office Action mailed November 17, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended herein.

**CLAIM SUMMARY**

Claims 1, 5-16, 18-20, and 24-31 remain in the present application. Claims 2-4, 17, and 21-23 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 32-34 have been added to the present application.

Claims 14 and 30 stand allow.

**DRAWING OBJECTIONS**

The November 17, 2006 Office Action objected to the drawings. A replacement sheet accompanies this Response. In the replacement sheet, Figure 4 has been amended to correct all the errors noted by the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that the amended drawing overcomes the objections.

**SPECIFICATION AMENDMENTS**

As part of this amendment, the disclosure has been amended to correct additional, previously undetected informalities. No new matter has been entered.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY****RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****FEB 20 2007**

102 REJECTIONS

In the November 17, 2006 Office Action, claims 1, 5, 10-13, 15, 16, 18-20, 27-29, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,650,089 issued to Freeman et al. (hereinafter "Freeman"). Applicant has amended the claims to clearly distinguish over Freeman. For example, amended claim 1 includes:

An apparatus comprising:  
an input power port;  
an output power rail, said output power rail to supply power to a load powered by the apparatus;  
a battery unit; and  
a system charger voltage regulator (VR) to couple the input power port to the battery unit, and said battery unit to couple with the system charger VR and the output power rail,  
wherein said system charger VR is to provide a regulated voltage signal when a power source is coupled to the input power port, said regulated voltage signal to simultaneously power both the output power rail and the battery unit, and  
wherein said battery unit is to provide a battery voltage signal to power the output power rail when no power source is coupled to the input power port.

The apparatus of amended claim 1 includes an input power port, a system charger, a battery unit, and an output power rail. There are at least two important aspects of how these four components are situated that should be noted.

First, the four components are situated such that the output power rail can supply power from the system charger to a load that is powered by the apparatus.

Second, when a power source is coupled to the input port, the system charger can simultaneously power both the battery unit and the output power rail.

- 14 -

Atty. Docket No.: P17639  
Application No.: 10/750,568

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

In other words, the system charger of amended claim 1 is between the input power port and the output power rail.

Freeman, in contrast, does not suggest, disclose, or enable providing the output of a charger to the output power port of a power supply circuit, nor does Freeman suggest, disclose, or enable powering both a battery unit and an output power port simultaneously with the voltage from the charger. In other words, Freeman does not show a charger that is situated between an input power port and an output power port. In each embodiment described in Freeman, when an input power source is available, its voltage is delivered to the output power port by a path that excludes the charger.

For example, in Figure 1 of Freeman, the output power port of the circuit is labeled "LOAD" at the output of SYSTEM SUPPLY SWITCH 28. The input power source is labeled "DC" at the inputs to CHARGER 26 and SWITCH 28.

As stated at Column 4, lines 11-19 of Freeman:

If DC power is available, the control system 12 provides DC power through the system supply switch 28 and isolates the battery bus 22 from the load, so that power from the DC supply is provided to the load. The charge from the charger 26 can then be made available at the battery power bus 22. If DC power is not available, the control system 12 provides selected battery power through the system supply switch 28 and isolates the DC supply from the load, so that power from the selected battery is provided to the load.

At no time is the output voltage from the charger made available to the LOAD output. In fact, when charger 26 is generating a charge, switch 28 isolates the charge from the LOAD output.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Figure 2 of Freeman describes a very similar arrangement of input port DC, charger 62, switch 64, and output port LOAD SUPPLY.

Figure 5 of Freeman does not specifically show the details of the electrical paths from the input port DCIN to the output load 148 or battery packs 142 and 146. At Column 8, lines 39-42, however, Freeman specifically states:

If DCIN is available, the DCIN voltage is provided as a system supply voltage ( $V_{sys}$ ) to portable unit devices 148, and a charge voltage (CHARGE) is provided to the battery selector 124, which supplies charge to one or both of the first battery pack 142 and the second battery pack 146.

In other words, the circuit clearly does NOT supply the charge voltage to the load, but instead provides the input voltage to the load.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is patentable over Freeman.

Applicant respectfully submits that the reasoning presented above is similarly applicable to independent claims 16 and 20, as amended. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16 and 20 are likewise patentable over Freeman.

Given that claims 5, 10-13, and 15 depend from claim 1, claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 16, and claims 27-29 and 31 depend from claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 10-13, 15, 18, 19, 27-29, and 31 are likewise patentable over Freeman for at least the reasons discussed above.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

In the November 17, 2006 Office Action, claims 1, 5-7, 10-13, 16, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,789,098 issued to Pinder (hereinafter "Pinder").

As stated in the Office Action, Pinder describes a circuit that can detect when an external voltage source is available so that a battery conservation mode can be disabled in a portable communications device. Pinder, however, only mentions a charger in passing. Specifically, Pinder describes a switching circuit 120 that can optionally include a battery charger 100 (Pinder: col. 2, lines 62-63). More to the point, Pinder describes passing an external operating voltage to the device being powered (Pinder: col. 2, lines 21-26). This external voltage can be used to power both the device and to charge the internal batteries (Pinder: col. 2, lines 37-41), but Pinder mentions only one use for the optional charger, which is to charge the battery.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Pinder clearly does not suggest, disclose, or enable providing the output of a charger to the output power port of a power supply circuit, nor does Pinder suggest, disclose, or enable powering both a battery unit and an output power port simultaneously with the voltage from the charger.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is patentable over Pinder.

Applicant respectfully submits that the reasoning presented above similarly applies to independent claim 16, as amended. Therefore, for at least

17

Atty. Docket No.: P17639  
Application No.: 10/750,568

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16, as amended, is patentable over Pinder.

Given that claims 5-7 and 10-13 depend from claim 1, and claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 16, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-7, 10-13, 18, and 19 are likewise patentable over Pinder for at least the reasons discussed above.

**103 REJECTIONS**

In the November 17, 2006 Office Action, claims 8 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinder.

Given that claims 8 and 15 depend from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8 and 15 are patentable over Pinder for at least the reasons discussed above.

In the November 17, 2006 Office Action, claims 9 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinder in view of Freeman.

Applicant respectfully submits that Freeman does not cure the deficiencies of Pinder, as discussed above. Therefore, given that claim 9 depends from claim 1, and claims 24-26 depend from claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 24-26 are patentable over Pinder in view of Freeman for at least the reasons discussed above.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 20 2007

## NEW CLAIMS

Given that new claim 32 depends from claim 1, new claim 33 depends from claim 16, and new claim 34 depends from claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 32-34 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above.


## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 5-16, 18-20, and 24-34 are now in a condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of such claims.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to our Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

INTEL CORPORATION

Date: 2/20, 2007  
Robert A. Diehl  
Reg. No. 40,992

INTEL LEGAL  
SC4-202  
P.O. Box 5326  
Santa Clara, CA 95056-5326  
Phone: (503) 712-1880  
FAX: (503) 264-1729

- 19 -

Atty. Docket No.: P17639  
Application No.: 10/750,568